



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,538	08/03/2001	Michio Okamura	116-990299	8044

7590 01/14/2003

David C. Hanson
Webb Ziesenhein Logsdon Orkin & Hanson, P.C.
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, STUART L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1754

19

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. <i>921538</i>	Applicant(s) <i>Alf Okamoto</i>
Examiner <i>W. Jackson</i>	Group Art Unit <i>1104</i>

Ch

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address--

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/02.
- This action is **FINAL**.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,11 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 2,7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1,4,6,11 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The request filed on 11/13/02 for a Continued Examination (RCE) based on parent Application No. 09/921538 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) In claims 1 and 4, 'graphite-like' is unclear if graphite is claimed, and how close it has to be.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The 'less than 400' limitation is not supported. There is no data for this broad range.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Miyabayashi et al.

The reference teaches in ex. 1-1 a graphitized material having the claimed d002 spacing. The area is 'greater than 100', within the range claimed. Although it is not characterized as 'graphite-like' and differs in the way it was made, any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to establish that their product

is patentably distinct not the examiner to show that the same process of making, see In re Brown, 173 U.S.P.Q 685, and In re Fessmann, 180 U.S.P.Q. 324. The intended use does not limit the material.

Claims 4, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyabayashi et al. The reference teaches the carbon, but not a capacitor. However, use in a capacitor is taught in column 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the carbon of Miyabayashi as a capacitor because doing so exploits its electrical properties. Concerning claim 11, holding plates in a confined structure is an obvious expedient to prevent ruining the battery during shipping. The effect 'limiting expansion' is deemed possessed by the fact that it is a confining structure.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyabayashi et al. as applied to claims 1, 4 and 11 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al.

Miyabayashi does not teach the claimed solvent/electrolyte. Suzuki does in column 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed material in the system of Miyabayashi because doing so provides a ammonium electrolyte suggested in col. 11.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reference may possess the surface area; the ranges overlap.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754